

REMARKS

The applicant thanks the examiner for the telephone interview held on 11 June 2007 with the applicant's representative, David Feigenbaum, and his colleague, Frank Gerratana.

In the interview, Mr. Feigenbaum pointed out that each of the "regions" in claim 1 contains data that is "all either locked or not locked for writing at a given time," a feature that the cited portions of Hapner simply did not describe and would not have made obvious.

The examiner also speculated in the interview that the word regions in claim 1 could be construed broadly enough to include, for example, portions of a distributed database that are located in different cities and that Hapner's database could have had such database portions and therefore have met the language of claim 1.

Although the examiner confirmed that an amendment to define regions more specifically might be useful, the applicant now believes that no clarification of regions is needed and has instead amended claim 1 to recite that each of the regions is assigned "to a respective available processor, each of the regions being assignable to any of the processors." The cited portions of Hapner and Somani give no hint of assigning such regions to processors, let alone of being able to assign a region to any of the processors.

Additional comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

6. **The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The arrangement of the specification is not in the required order. Appropriate correction is required.**

The applicant disagrees, but has amended the specification for convenience.

B6  
01/04/08